

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached eight sheets of drawings include sheets of formal drawings for Figs. 1-6, 8 and 10. Those sheets replace the original Figs. 1-6, 8 and 10. The formal drawings address the issues objected to by the Examiner in the Office Action. No substantive changes were made and no new matter was added.

Attachment: Eight Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending.

Claims 1 and 3-8 stand rejected.

Claims 1 and 3-8 have been amended. No new matter is added.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to for including shading in the figures. Applicants have submitted replacement drawings herewith which do not include any shading. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The specification stands objected to for failing to include art-accepted terminology. The Examiner states that the term “disk radial portion” should be replaced with “spoke” to ensure consistency with art-accepted terminology. The specification has been amended to replace the term “disk radial portion” with “disk spoke.” Although the Examiner recommended amending the term “disk radial portion” to “spoke,” Applicants retained the word disk in order to distinguish the “disk spoke” and the “deformable narrow spoke portions” of the disk. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1 and 3-8 stand objected to because the term “disk radial portion” should be replaced with “spoke.” Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3-8 to replace the term “disk radial portion” with the term “disk spoke” for the reasons set forth above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is objected to for informalities. Applicants have amended claim 7 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 is objected to for informalities. Applicants have amended claim 8 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 5 and 8 to address the rejections. With respect to claim 5, the term "to be" has been removed from the claim. With respect to claim 8, the claim has been amended to recite a "disk spoke" and a "deformable narrow spoke portion," such that proper antecedent is provided throughout the claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 and 3-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,577,809 to Chase. The Examiner states that Chase discloses every feature of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite that the "thin, deformable parts have a smaller height in comparison with the rest of the deformable narrow spoke portions." The specification sets forth that "the easily deformable parts are made relatively thin for example by lowering the height of the U-shape of cross section" (page 9, lines 28 and 29 of the specification submitted herewith). This provides a distinct advantage in that the deformable parts "can easily follow the greatest elastic deformation of the disk spoke" (page 9, lines 30 and 31 of the specification submitted herewith).

In contrast, there is no indication that the webs 14b described in Chase include thin deformable parts having a height that is smaller than the rest of the web 14b. Thus, Chase does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1 or 8. Accordingly, claims 1 and 8 are patentable over

Application No. 10/531,812
Amendment dated June 12, 2007
Response to Final Office Action

Docket No.: 05677/0202587-US0

Chase. Claims 3-7 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.
Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Edward J. Ellis

Registration No.: 40,389
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachments